```
1
   WO
2
3
4
5
6
7
                    IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8
                        FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA
9
10
11
12
   Carina Boon,
13
                   Plaintiff,
                                       No. CIV 04-1037 PHX RCB
14
                                                ORDER
             VS.
   Kenneth S. Countryman, P.C.,
15
16
                   Defendant.
17
18
        On May 21, 2004, Plaintiff filed a complaint against Kenneth
   S. Countryman, P.C., claiming damages due to legal malpractice.
19
20
   Comp. (doc. 1). Plaintiff did not serve Defendant with the
21
   complaint and summons until March 11, 2005. (doc. 13). Thereafter,
   Defendant filed a motion to dismiss this case with prejudice.
22
23
   Motion to Dismiss (doc. 14). On March 31, 2005, Plaintiff filed a
24
   motion requesting that this matter be set for trial. Motion for
25
   Trial (doc. 15). Neither party filed a response to the opposing
26
   party's motion.
27
        In his motion to dismiss, Defendant moves the Court to dismiss
```

this action with prejudice. Motion to Dismiss (doc. 14) at 1. Two

Case 2:04-cv-01037-RCB Document 16 Filed 10/05/05 Page 2 of 2

of the grounds asserted by Defendant in support of dismissal are

(1) that the Court lacks jurisdiction over the person of Defendant;

and (2) that there is no diversity among the parties to the action.

Id. However, Defendant raises no arguments in support of his

request that the case be dismissed with prejudice. Motion to

Dismiss (doc. 14).

Upon review of Plaintiff's complaint, the Court notes that Boon does not assert any federal claims. (doc. 1). In her complaint, she only indicates an intention to pursue legal malpractice claims. Id. Moreover, Plaintiff's complaint does not establish diversity among the parties or that the amount in controversy meets the required minimum to qualify for diversity jurisdiction. Thus, the Court concludes that it lacks jurisdiction over this matter. However, the Court is not convinced that the matter should be dismissed with prejudice.

Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED that Defendant's motion to dismiss (doc. 14) is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part. This case is dismissed without prejudice.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion to set this matter for trial (doc. 15) is DENIED as moot.

DATED this 4th day of October, 2005.

Copies to counsel of record

C.

Broomfield

Senior United States District Judge